UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,773	01/14/2004	Tomoaki Endo	03500.013745.1	2334

5514   7590   03/01/2010
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER
WASHINGTON, JAMARES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 February 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *69-91* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *69-91* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 18, 2010 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Amendments and response received February 18, 2010 have been entered. Claims 69-91

are currently pending in this application. Claims 69, 79 and 89 have been amended and claims

92-94 have been canceled. Amendments and response are addressed hereinbelow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 69, 79 and 89, and all claims dependent thereon, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The scope of the claimed subject matter

cannot be determined by one having ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 69 sets forth "an inhibition unit adapted to, if at least one of the plural setting

values of the job is determined not to satisfy a predetermined condition…, inhibit issuance of the

job by the issuance unit". However, claim 69 further reads "wherein the inhibition unit allows

issuance of the job by the issuance unit, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job is

determined to satisfy the predetermined condition, based on a first determination of whether both

of the values of the first and second attributes satisfy the predetermined condition and a second

determination of whether either…satisfies the predetermined condition". These statements

within the claim directly contradict one another as the issuance of the job would be inhibited "if

at least one of the plural setting values of the job is determined not to satisfy a predetermined

condition" regardless of the finding that "at least one of the plural setting values of the job is

determined to satisfy the predetermined condition". Therefore, it is not clear to one of ordinary

skill the scope of the claimed subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is clear from the originally disclosed specification and accompanying drawings that

these limitations are to be separated as to not refer to the same "plural setting values of the job".

For instance, Fig. 74 (numerals 5602 & 5605) clearly shows that the "job attribute" value first

determines whether a "job will be issued, which correlates to the first limiation of the recited

portion of the claim in which "an inhibition unit adapted to, if at least one of the plural setting

values of the job is determined not to satisfy a predetermined condition…, inhibit issuance of the

job by the issuance unit" and subsequently followed by the "inhibited attribute" value

determination (numerals 5603-5606) wherein the second portion of the claim reads on checking

whether the "attribute combination" determines the issuance of a job in that "the inhibition unit

allows issuance of the job by the issuance unit, if at least one of the plural setting values of the

job is determined to satisfy the predetermined condition…". A clear distinction needs to be

drawn between the aforementioned steps to clearly point out that determination is not made from

the same "plural setting values".

Claims 79 and 89, and all claims dependent thereon, are rejected for similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 69-71, 73, 75-81, 83 and 85-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yousef R. Yacoub (6552813 B2) in view of Albert Aiello, Jr. et al (US

6337745 B1).

*Note – Examiner broadly interprets the subject matter discussed in the 112 rejection above in

accordance with the rejections as follows.

Regarding claim 69, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus (Fig. 5

numeral 600 client station) for controlling via a communication medium (Fig. 5 numeral 650

network) a peripheral (Fig. 5 numeral 660 or 670, printers) that processes a job, which executes a

predetermined service, the apparatus comprising:

an obtaining unit adapted to obtain (Fig. 5 numeral 610 virtual printer via numeral 620

network interface), via the communication medium (Fig. 5 network 650, communication

medium), function information that includes information indicating plural setting values

executable by the peripheral ("Virtual printer 610 receives other data, from the server 680 or a

database in client 600, such as the capabilities of the printers so that the virtual printer can find

the most appropriate printer, one that complies with the user's print job preferences" at Col. 11

line 46. Information regarding the capabilities of the printers reads on information indicating

plural setting values as each function has to be given a value indicating it's capability to perform

or a value indicating the function cannot be performed); and

an inhibition unit (Fig. 5 numeral 610 virtual printer).

Yacoub fails to explicitly disclose an issuance unit adapted to issue a job provided with

plural setting values including a value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute

different from the first attribute.

Aiello et al, in the same field of endeavor of directing print jobs to printers in accordance

with attributes needed for the job and the capabilities of a connected printer (Col. 2 lines 29-34),

teaches an issuance unit adapted to issue a job provided with plural setting values including a

value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute different from the first attribute (Col. 2

lines 25- 39 wherein the user may "drag-and-drop" the print job to a selected printer. The method

also prevents/inhibits drag-and-drop if attributes of the print job do not match that of the printer;

Col. 5 lines 32-45 wherein print "resources" and printer's "set-up" read on the claimed plural

setting values including first and second attributes (e.g., fonts and overlays combined with the

printer's set-up) having values (i.e., checked or unchecked indicating availability). The "values"

are described at Col. 8 lines 39-44 wherein resources are indicated available or not available).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made for information processing apparatus comprising an obtaining unit and an inhibition

unit as disclosed by Yacoub to include an issuance unit adapted to issue a job provided with

plural setting values including a value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute

different from the first attribute as taught by Aiello et al for additional control over print jobs

while providing a flexible, easy-to-use operator interface.

Yacoub fails to explicitly disclose the inhibition unit being adapted to, if at least one of

the plural setting values of the job is determined not to satisfy a predetermined condition related

to the plural setting values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit,

inhibit issuance of the job by the issuance unit and wherein the inhibition unit allows issuance of

the job by the issuance unit, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job is determined to

satisfy the predetermined condition, based on a first determination of whether both of the values

of the first and second attributes satisfy the predetermined condition and a second determination

of whether either of the values of the first and second attributes satisfies the predetermined

condition.

Aiello et al teaches inhibiting issuance of the job by the issuance unit if at least one of the

plural setting values of the job related to the user instruction does not satisfy a predetermined

condition related to the "plural setting values indicated by the function information" (Col. 2 lines

37-39 wherein drag-and-drop is prevented if the printer's "set-up" is determined incompatible

with the print job's "set-up". The respective "set-up" reads on at least one setting value indicated

by the function information as this term is used to describe the configuration or "attributes" of

the printer corresponding to the needs of the print job) and wherein the inhibition unit allows

issuance of the job by the issuance unit, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job

satisfies the predetermined condition (Col. 2 lines 29-36, wherein only the printer set-up

information may be used to determine printing inhibition), based on a first determination of

whether both of the values of the first and second attributes satisfy the predetermined condition

(i.e., using both the printer "set-up" information and "resources" available). Although not

explicitly taught, it would have been obvious given both the disclosure of Aiello et al to provide

a second determination of whether either of the values of the first and second attributes satisfies

the predetermined condition (wherein, as stated above, the printer set-up information or resource

information may be used in the determination to allow or inhibit the printing process).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made for the inhibition unit as disclosed by Yacoub to be adapted to, if at least one of the

plural setting values of the job is determined not to satisfy a predetermined condition related to

the plural setting values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit,

inhibit issuance of the job by the issuance unit, wherein the inhibition unit allows issuance of the

job by the issuance unit, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job is determined to

satisfy the predetermined condition, based on a first determination of whether both of the values

of the first and second attributes satisfy the predetermined condition and a second determination

of whether either of the values of the first and second attributes satisfies the predetermined

condition as taught by Aiello et al to improve the invention as disclosed by Yacoub in a manner

which aids in print job distribution and control. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have

recognized that applying the known technique of inhibiting issuance of the print job to the printer

or allowing issuance of the print job according to the above criteria as taught by Aiello would

have yielded predictable results and would have improved the information processing apparatus

of Yacoub in determining if and how to route print jobs more efficiently.

Regarding claim 70, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to

Claim 69, wherein the function information obtained by the obtaining unit includes information

indicating a job attribute range executable by the peripheral ("... speed can be variable and have

many values from which the user can choose, such as slow, slower, fast, fastest or medium" Col.

5 lines 15. This indicates a "range" of one of the attributes of the printer), and further comprising

a display unit (Fig. 5 numeral 640 user interface) adapted to distinguishably display the job

attribute range on a user interface (Col. 11 lines 25-28; as mentioned before, the range of speed

is an attribute that can be selected on the interface) provided in a control program for controlling

the peripheral based on the obtained function information (Col. 11 line 31-36 wherein the

preferences selected by the user are sent to the virtual printer which "controls" the "appropriate"

printer to output the preferences selected. Col. 11 lines 3-6 wherein software (a control program)

manages hardware within the system).

Regarding claim 71, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to

Claim 69, wherein the obtaining unit obtains information indicating a function setting range

executable by the peripheral ("... speed can be variable and have many values from which the

user can choose, such as slow, slower, fast, fastest or medium" Col. 5 lines 15. This indicates a

"range" of one of the attributes of the printer).

Regarding claim 73, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to

Claim 69, wherein the obtaining unit obtains information indicating a function selectable in the

peripheral ("Virtual printer 610 receives other data, from the server 680 or a database in client

600, such as the capabilities of the printers..." Col. 11 line 46).

Regarding claim 75, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to

Claim 69, wherein the obtaining unit obtains from the peripheral an attribute list indicating

functions corresponding to one of a physical device control program, a logical device control

program, a resource control program of the peripheral and a coordinate control program for

coordination thereof ("Further, while some printers are capable of understanding one of the

printer languages such as either Postscript or PCL but not both, a further print job preference

may be the printer language which either the software/application used in generating the print

job" at Col. 8 line 26. Indicating an attribute sent to the "virtual printer" for making

determinations can include the language supported by the peripheral which is readable on a

logical device control program; Fig. 4 shows the layout of a typical office suite having both laser

and inkjet printing devices, indicating information obtained from the peripheral devices will

include the type of printer which would be controlled by the client station. Therefore, physical

device control programs would need to be acquired in order to print from both laser and inkjet

printers located in the office setting).

Regarding claim 76, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 75, wherein the physical device control program includes at least one of a scanner control program that controls a scanner engine of the peripheral, a laser beam printer control program that controls a laser beam printer engine of the peripheral, and an ink jet printer control program that controls an ink jet printer engine of the peripheral (see rejection of claim 75; Suggesting laser and inkjet printers are controlled).

Regarding claim 77, discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 75, wherein the logical device control program includes at least one of a print job control program that controls a laser beam printer control program, a print job control program that controls an ink jet printer control program, a print job control program that controls the laser beam printer control program and the ink jet printer control program, a scan job control program that controls a scanner control program, a copy job control program that controls the scanner control program and the laser beam printer control program, and a copy job control program that controls the scanner control program and the ink jet printer control program (see rejection of claim 75 wherein print job control programs, using either PCL or Postscript languages, are utilized to control the laser and inkjet printers).

Regarding claim 78, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to Claim 69, wherein the obtaining unit obtains the function information from the peripheral (Col. 5 lines 41-44 wherein the virtual printer will query...all printers present in...an office suite...").

Regarding claim 79, Yacoub discloses an information processing method for controlling via a communication medium a peripheral that processes a job which executes a predetermined service (see rejection of claims 69; apparatus implementing the method), the method comprising:

an obtaining step of obtaining, via the communication medium, function information that includes information indicating plural setting values executable by the peripheral (see rejection of claim 69);

an issuance step of issuing a job provided with plural setting values including a value of a first attribute and a value of a second attribute different from the first attribute (see rejection of claim 69); and

an inhibition step of, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job is determined not to satisfy a predetermined condition related to the plural setting values indicated by the function information obtained by the obtaining unit, inhibiting issuance of the job in the issuance step (see rejection of claim 69),

wherein the inhibiting step includes allowing issuance of the job in the issuance step, if at least one of the plural setting values of the job is determined to satisfy the predetermined condition, based on a first determination of whether both of the values of the first and second attributes satisfy the predetermined condition or a second determination of whether either of the values of the first and second attributes satisfies the predetermined condition, based on a first determination of whether both of the values of the first and second attributes satisfy the predetermined condition and a second determination of whether either of the values of the first and second attributes satisfies the predetermined condition (see rejection of claim 69), and

wherein at least one of the above steps is performed by a computer processor (Col. 11
lines 50-51 wherein the virtual printer may be hardware).

Regarding claim 80, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to
Claim 79, wherein the function information obtained in the obtaining step includes information
indicating a job attribute range executable by the peripheral, and wherein the method further
comprises a step of distinguishably displaying on a display unit the job attribute range on a user
interface provided in a control program for controlling the peripheral based on the obtained
function information (see rejection of claim 70).

Regarding claim 81, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to
Claim 79, wherein the obtaining step includes obtaining information indicating a function setting
range executable by the peripheral (see rejection of claim 71).

Regarding claim 83, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to
Claim 79, wherein the obtaining step includes obtaining information indicating a function
selectable in the peripheral (see rejection of claim 73).

Regarding claim 85, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to
Claim 79, wherein the obtaining step includes obtaining from the peripheral an attribute list
indicating functions corresponding to one of a physical device control program, a logical device

control program, a resource control program of the peripheral and a coordinate control program

for coordination thereof (see rejection of claim 75).

Regarding claim 86, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to

Claim 85, wherein the physical device control program includes at least one of a scanner control

program that controls a scanner engine of the peripheral, a laser beam printer control program

that controls a laser beam printer engine of the peripheral, and an ink jet printer control program

that controls an ink jet printer engine of the peripheral (see rejection of claim 76).

Regarding claim 87, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to

Claim 85, wherein the logical device control program includes at least one of a print job control

program that controls a laser beam printer control program, a print job control program that

controls an ink jet printer control program, a print job control program that controls the laser

beam printer control program and the ink jet printer control program, a scan job control program

that controls a scanner control program, a copy job control program that controls the scanner

control program and the laser beam printer control program, and a copy job control program that

controls the scanner control program and the ink jet printer control program (see rejection of

claim 77).

Regarding claim 88, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to

Claim 79, wherein the obtaining step includes obtaining the function information from the

peripheral (see rejection of claim 78).

Regarding claim 89, Yacoub discloses a computer-readable storage medium, storing, in executable form, a program for causing an information processing apparatus to control via a communication medium a peripheral that processes a job, which executes a predetermined service, the program comprising:

obtaining code, issuance code and inhibiting code for implementing the method as described in claim 79 above (Col. 11 lines 16-19 wherein the virtual printer can be a combination of software and hardware which reads on a storage medium storing the program to implement the method as rejected in claim 79 above).

5.   Claims 72, 82, 90 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yacoub in view of Aiello, Jr. et al as applied to claim 69 above, and further in view of Koichi Murakami (EP 0529692 A2).

Regarding claim 72, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to claim 71 further comprising:

a determination unit (see rejection of claim 69; virtual printer 610) adapted to determine whether an inhibition attribute is set for the job (see rejection of claim 69 wherein acquiring the capabilities of the printer gives the attributes not supported by the printer, by default); and wherein the inhibition unit inhibits issuance of the job by the issuance unit (see rejection of claim 69).

Yacoub fails to explicitly disclose a discrimination unit adapted to discriminate whether a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited, if the determination unit determines that an inhibition attribute is set for the job and inhibiting issuance of the job if the discrimination unit discriminates that a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited.

Murakami, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a discrimination unit adapted to discriminate whether a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited if the determination unit determines that an inhibition attribute is set for the job (Col. 16 lines 36-50 wherein there must exist a "discrimination unit" adapted to determine the stapling capability corresponding to the number of sheets counted when a predetermined number of sheets will inhibit stapling. Stapling capability to number of sheets reads on a "combination of attributes" which would inhibit printing if the count exceeded a predetermined number), and inhibiting issuance of the job if the discrimination unit discriminates that a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited (Col. 16 lines 47-52 wherein issuance of the job is prohibited when the number of sheets exceeds a predetermined number).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Yacoub to utilize the process and accompanying unit as taught by Murakami wherein a discrimination unit adapted to discriminate whether a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited if the determination unit determines that an inhibition attribute is set for the job and inhibiting issuance of the job if the discrimination unit discriminates that a combination of attributes set for the job is inhibited because the modification to use the discrimination unit as taught by Murakami would have constituted the mere arrangement of prior art elements with each performing the same function it

had been known to perform, the combination yielding no more than one would expect from such

an arrangement. Clearly utilizing the range of acceptable sheets which would allow stapling as

taught by Murakami would have provided the predictable results of sending the predetermined

number of sheets required for stapling to be possible, along with additional attributes of the

printer, to the determination unit as disclosed by Yacoub to evaluate whether the print job should

be issued.

Regarding claim 82, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to

Claim 81, wherein the information indicating the function setting range is expressed with a

combination of attributes for which a job setting is inhibited (see rejection of claim 72).

Regarding claim 90, Yacoub discloses an information processing apparatus according to

claim 69.

Yacoub fails to disclose wherein the setting values of a job include a setting value as to a

number of print sheets and a setting value as to a finisher device of the peripheral, and wherein

the inhibition unit inhibits issuance of the job if the setting value as to the number of print sheets

exceeds a predetermined value.

Murakami, in the same field of endeavor of print job finishing, teaches wherein a setting

value of a job includes a setting value as to a number of print sheets (Col. 16 lines 47-48 wherein

the count of the originals is taken) and a setting value as to a finisher device of the peripheral

(Col. 16 lines 47-48 wherein a setting value for a finisher device has to be determined in order to

compare the count of the originals), and wherein the issuance of the job is inhibited if the setting

value as to the number of print sheets exceeds a predetermined value (Col. 16 lines 51-52

wherein the job may be prohibited if the count or the originals exceeds the devices finishing

capabilities).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made for the information processing apparatus as disclosed by Yacoub to utilize the

obtaining unit for obtaining a number of print sheets and a setting value as to a finisher device of

a peripheral and wherein the issuance of the job is inhibited if the setting value as to the number

of print sheets exceeds a predetermined value as taught by Murakami to avoid possible staple

jams from stapler being over charged or incurring any other damage to a finishing device due to

excessive use.

Regarding claim 91, Yacoub discloses an information processing method according to

claim 79, wherein the setting values of a job include a setting value as to a number of print sheets

and a setting value as to a finisher device of the peripheral, and wherein the inhibiting step

inhibits issuance of the job if the setting value as to the number of print sheets exceeds a

predetermined value (see rejection of claim 90).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed February 18, 2010 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks: Nothing in Aiello, Jr. et al is believed to teach or suggest that the Queue

Manager instructs the GUI to permit the dragging-and-dropping of the selected print job from the

list of received print jobs onto the printer icon print of the selected printer, if at least one of the

print resource required for the selected print job is determined to satisfy a predetermined

condition. Moreover, nothing in Aiello, Jr. et al. is believed to teach or suggest that the Queue

Manager makes a first determination of whether both of two print resources required for the

selected print job satisfy a predetermined condition and a second determination of whether either

of the two print resources required for the selected print job satisfies the predetermined

condition.

Examiner's response: Aiello, Jr. et al teaches in Col. 5 lines 32-45 wherein printer "set-up"

information and resource information are handled in a similar manner, via notification through

the GUI. As stated in Col. 2 lines 25- 39, notification through the GUI may consist of

"preventing and permitting the drag-and-drop of the selected print job". Therefore, Aiello, Jr. et

al teaches permitting the drag-and-drop process when a printer is determined to have a set-up

(i.e., at least one of set-up or resources) compatible with the selected print job.

As stated above in the rejection of claim 69, Aiello, Jr. teaches utilizing both "resources"

and "printer set-up" to make the determination whether the print job will be issued in addition to

using only the "printer set-up" information to make a determination whether to issue a print job.

Therefore, Aiello, Jr. reads on the claimed subject matter as set forth in the rejection of claim 69.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMARES WASHINGTON whose telephone number is (571) 270-1585. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday: 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Jamares Washington/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/J. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

February 25, 2010